arXiv:1611.09916v1 [quant-ph] 29 Nov 2016

New Bell inequalities for three-qubit pure states

Arpan Das,[1,2,*] Chandan Datta,[1,2,†] and Pankaj Agrawal[1,2,‡]

[1] *Institute of Physics, Sachivalaya Marg, Sainik School, Bhubaneswar 751005, Odisha, India*
[2] *Homi Bhabha National Institute, Training School Complex, Anushakti Nagar, Mumbai 400085, India.*

We introduce a set of Bell inequalities for a three-qubit system. Each inequality within this set is violated by all generalized GHZ states. More entangled a generalized GHZ state is, more will be the violation. Certain inequalities within this set are violated by pure biseparable states. We also provide numerical evidence that at least one of these Bell inequalities is violated by a pure genuinely entangled state. These Bell inequalities can distinguish between separable, biseparable and genuinely entangled pure three-qubit states. We also generalize this set to n-qubit systems and may be suitable to characterize the entanglement of n-qubit pure states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent loophole free tests [1] of Bell inequalities have firmly established that certain correlations of quantum states cannot be explained by a local hidden variable (LHV) model. Bell [2] had demonstrated that correlations in a local-realistic theory must obey an inequality – Bell inequality. He considered a simple situation of two spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particles in a singlet state and showed that quantum mechanics is not compatible with local-realistic theories. Since then, this result has been generalized in many different directions [3]. In the simplest scenario (two parties, two measurement settings and two outcomes per setting), all Bell inequalities are equivalent to the Clauser-Horner-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality [4]. This is because CHSH inequality is the only nontrivial facet of Bell polytope for such a scenario [3]. According to Gisin's theorem [5], all pure bipartite entangled states violate this inequality. The maximum allowed expectation value of CHSH operator for a quantum system is $2\sqrt{2}$. This bound is known as the Tsirelson's bound [6]. However, the violation of a Bell inequality is only sufficient criteria for certifying entanglement but not a necessary one. Even in the case of two-qubit states, there is a phenomena of hidden nonlocality, which is typified by Werner state [7]. However this phenomena occurs for mixed states.

In this paper, we will consider pure multipartite states. Unlike a pure bipartite state, the relationship between Bell nonlocality and entanglement is far from simple [8]. For three-qubit states, we will adopt following terminology. A state $|\psi\rangle$ is a pure separable or product state if it can be written in the form $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\psi_3\rangle$, a pure biseparable state if it can be written as $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_{23}\rangle$ or in other permutations and is genuinely entangled if it cannot be written in a product form. Above classification is based on types of entanglement present in the state. Idea of non-separability according to Bell locality comes from the inability of construction of a LHV model for observed correlations. In this case, the quantum mechanical description is not presupposed. For a system of three particles, if the joint probability can be written as,

$$P(a_1, a_2, a_3) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) P_1(a_1|\lambda) P_2(a_1|\lambda) P_3(a_1|\lambda),$$

where $P_i(a_i|\lambda)(i = 1, 2, 3)$ is the probability of yielding the result a_i, when a measurement A_i is done on the particle containing the local hidden variable λ, then the model is called the well known LHV model. The intermediate case is the hybrid local-nonlocal model, first considered by Svetlichny [9], where there is an arbitrary nonlocal correlation between two of the three particles but only local correlations between these two and the third particle. And the last situation is genuine tripartite nonlocality, where three particles are allowed to share arbitrary correlations. In the case of three qubits, violation of Mermin-Ardehali-Belinskii-Klyshko (MABK) inequalities [10, 11] gives sufficient criteria to distinguish separable states from entangled ones. But it is not a necessary condition as there are states, which do no violate MABK inequalities but have genuine tripartite entanglement [12]. More precisely, in [12] it was shown that the n-qubit state, $|\psi\rangle = \cos\alpha\,|0...0\rangle + \sin\alpha\,|1...1\rangle$ would not violate MABK inequalities for $\sin 2\alpha \leq 1/\sqrt{2^{N-1}}$. In general, it is very difficult to discriminate between biseparable and genuinely entangled states. MABK inequalities give a sufficient condition to distinguish them [8, 11, 13]. However as the condition is only sufficient but not a necessary one, biseparable and genuinely entangled states cannot always be distinguished by means of these inequalities. Furthermore, they cannot be used to discriminate between the correlations due to tripartite genuine entanglement and local-nonlocal hybrid model [8]. Svetlichny constructed a stronger kind of inequality [9], which holds for three-particle local-nonlocal hybrid model and its violation guarantees the presence of tripartite genuine entanglement. According to Svetlichny's definition, genuine tripartite entanglement and genuine tripartite nonlocality are not equivalent, as there are tripartite genuinely entangled states which do not violate Svetlichny's inequality [14], i.e they are not genuinely tripartite nonlocal. Whereas Svetlichny's inequality allowed arbitrary nonlocal correlation between two parties,

* arpandas@iopb.res.in
† chandan@iopb.res.in
‡ agrawal@iopb.res.in

a more refined and strictly weaker definition of genuine tripartite nonlocality was introduced in [15]. By analyzing the no-signalling polytope, they found a set of 185 inequivalent facet inequalities and conjectured that every genuine tripartite entangled states show violations within this set and hence they are also genuinely tripartite nonlocal according to their definition. Furthermore, in [16] it was shown that a class of states (generalized GHZ states within a specified parameter range for odd number of qubits) do not violate any correlation Bell inequalities, Werner-Wolf-Żukowski-Brukner (WWŻB) inequalities [17]. So, the question naturally arises whether one can construct inequalities, which will be violated by any pure three-qubit entangled states. Using Hardy's nonlocality argument, it has been shown that all pure entangled states violate a single Bell inequality [18]. We will now present a new set of Bell inequalities suitable for three-qubit pure states, without invoking Hardy's nonlocality arguments.

In this work, we have introduced a new set of Bell inequalities, such that if one or more violations from the set is obtained for a three-qubit pure state, then the state is entangled. Analytically we have shown that each inequality from the set is violated by all generalized GHZ states, though they don't always violate MABK or WWŻB inequalities. Also it has been proved that each pure biseparable state violates exactly four inequalities from the set by the same maximal amount. We have provided numerical evidence that any pure genuinely entangled state will violate one or more inequalities from the set. Taking all these into account, our set of inequalities can be used to certify three-qubit pure state entanglement. Also, from the pattern of violation of inequalities, we can always distinguish between a pure biseparable and a pure genuine tripartite entangled three-qubit state. Thus our criteria can detect and distinguish these two different types of entanglements present in three-qubit pure states. Related to this work, in a recent study [19], some operators have been constructed which can distinguish between six SLOCC (Stochastic local operation and classical communication) inequivalent classes for pure three-qubit states.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce a set of Bell inequalities for three-qubit states. In Section III, we show that any pure three-qubit entangled state will violate at least one of these inequalities. In Section IV, we generalize these inequalities to the case of n-qubits. The last section has conclusions.

II. A SET OF BELL INEQUALITIES

We consider a three-qubit system, with each qubit with Alice, Bob and Charlie. In the Bell inequalities that we introduce, two of the parties will make two measurements, while the third party will make only one measurement. This third party can be either Alice, Bob, or Charlie. A general state need not have any symmetry, therefore we will be considering a set of Bell inequalities, rather than one inequality. The one measurement by one of the parties is necessary. We note that in the original Bell inequality [2], one of the two parties makes only one measurement.

We will first list the set of 12 inequalities, and later explain the motivation. In this list, the left-hand side should be thought of as the expectation value of the observables. In the first and second inequality, Alice makes one measurement given by observable A_2 and A_1 respectively, Bob measures the observables B_1 and B_2, and Charlie measures observables C_1 and C_2. These are dichotomic observables, with values $\{-1, 1\}$. In the inequalities (3) and (4), Bob measures only one observable and similarly for the others.

$$A_2B_1(C_1+C_2)+B_2(C_1-C_2)\leq 2, \tag{1}$$
$$B_1(C_1+C_2)+A_1B_2(C_1-C_2)\leq 2, \tag{2}$$
$$A_2B_1(C_1+C_2)+A_1(C_1-C_2)\leq 2, \tag{3}$$
$$A_2(C_1+C_2)+A_1B_2(C_1-C_2)\leq 2, \tag{4}$$

$$(B_1+B_2)C_2+A_2(B_1-B_2)C_1\leq 2, \tag{5}$$
$$A_1(B_1+B_2)C_2+(B_1-B_2)C_1\leq 2, \tag{6}$$
$$A_1(B_1+B_2)+A_2(B_1-B_2)C_1\leq 2, \tag{7}$$
$$A_1(B_1+B_2)C_2+A_2(B_1-B_2)\leq 2, \tag{8}$$

$$(A_1+A_2)B_2+(A_1-A_2)B_1C_2\leq 2, \tag{9}$$
$$(A_1+A_2)B_2C_1+(A_1-A_2)B_1\leq 2, \tag{10}$$
$$(A_1+A_2)C_1+(A_1-A_2)B_1C_2\leq 2, \tag{11}$$
$$(A_1+A_2)B_2C_1+(A_1-A_2)C_2\leq 2. \tag{12}$$

To find the maximal violation of these inequalities for a state, one has to consider all possible measurements. Therefore, inequalities obtained by interchange of A_1 and A_2 will give identical maximal violation. Same will be true for other set of observables. Therefore, we do not include such inequalities in our set. In quantum mechanics, the maximal value of these Bell operators can be $2\sqrt{2}$.

To motivate these inequalities, our starting point will be CHSH inequality. This inequality reads as, $A_1B_1 + A_1B_2 + A_2B_1 - A_2B_2 \leq 2$, where A_1, A_2 are the measurement choices for Alice, B_1, B_2 are the measurement choices for Bob and 2 is the local-realistic value. Again in left-hand side, expectation value is implicit. From Tsirelson's bound [6], maximum value this operator can achieve for quantum states is $2\sqrt{2}$. This value is achieved for the maximally entangled states - Bell states. Let us consider the state $|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$. This state is suitable for generalization to GHZ state. For a suitable choice of measurements, for example, $A_1 = \sigma_x$, $A_2 = \sigma_z$, $B_1 = 1/\sqrt{2}(\sigma_x + \sigma_z)$ and $B_2 = 1/\sqrt{2}(\sigma_x - \sigma_z)$, we obtain the maximal violation of $2\sqrt{2}$. For this choice of measurements, the CHSH operator takes the form $\sqrt{2}(\sigma_x\otimes\sigma_x+\sigma_z\otimes\sigma_z)$. The state $|\phi^+\rangle$ is its eigenstate with

eigenvalue $2\sqrt{2}$ [20]. With local unitary transformations, we can find other forms of this operator, of which other Bell states will be eigenstates with maximal eigenvalue. Now, we want to construct an operator for three-qubit pure states such that, the GHZ state of three qubits will be the eigenstate of this operator with highest eigenvalue. Like the CHSH operator, we can construct an operator such that its maximum eigenvalue will be $2\sqrt{2}$. The GHZ state, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$, is the eigenstate of the operator $\sqrt{2}(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z \otimes I)$ with eigenvalue $2\sqrt{2}$. We can write other forms of this operator where identity operator acts on other qubits. We clearly see that we have even number of σ_z; here it is one fewer than the number of qubits. This suggests that we need to make only one measurement on one of the qubits. With the help of this operator, we can construct a simplest set of Bell inequalities. We need a set to take care of asymmetric situations. This set is given above. To look at it from a different point of view, identity in one place of the aforementioned operator gives us hint to construct non-correlation Bell inequality. Also from previous discussion, it is clear that to obtain violations for all pure entangled states, correlation Bell inequalities are not enough. So, it seems that non-correlation Bell inequalities may work. We show below by first considering generalized GHZ states and then arbitrary three-qubit states that it is indeed true.

III. THREE-QUBIT STATES

In this section, we will consider three different classes of states – product states, pure biseparable states, and states with genuine tripartite entanglement. We will see how our inequalities can distinguish these classes of states. In addition, we shall consider generalized GHZ states. Theses states are symmetric under the permutation of particles; so we can pick any of the inequalities. All will be violated in the same manner.

Proposition 1: *All generalized GHZ states violate all twelve inequalities of this set.*

Proof: Let's consider the three-qubit generalized GHZ state,

$$|GGHZ\rangle = \alpha\,|000\rangle + \beta\,|111\rangle\,. \tag{13}$$

These states have been problematic for different inequalities. However, as our Bell inequalities were designed for GHZ states, all of these generalized GHZ states violate all our inequalities. In the spirit of generalized Schmidt decomposition, we can take α and β to be real and positive numbers. Quantification of entanglement in multipartite scenario is a messy business. Unlike pure bipartite system, there is no unique measure of entanglement for multipartite states [21, 22]. One uses different measures depending upon different purposes. Von Neumann entropy uniquely captures and quantify the entanglement for a pure bipartite system in the asymptotic limit. For a pure multipartite state one can use the average of Von Neumann entropy over each bipartition as a suitable measure of multipartite entanglement [22]. For three qubit pure state, there are three bipartitions namely, $1-23$, $2-31$ and $3-12$. Average of Von Neumann entropy for generalized GHZ state as defined in equation (13) over these bipartitions is $-\alpha^2 \log_2 \alpha^2 - \beta^2 \log_2 \beta^2$. This is also the entropy for each bipartition for these states as the states are symmetric. We have plotted this average entropy with α^2 with $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$, in figure (1).



FIG. 1. Average Von Neumann entropy over the three bipartitions vs α^2 plot.

Since the states are symmetric under the permutations of particles, we can choose any Bell inequality from the set. We choose the inequality,

$$A_1(B_1 + B_2) + A_2(B_1 - B_2)C_1 \leq 2. \tag{14}$$

Let us recall that the expectation value for the left-hand side is implicit. We choose the following measurement settings, $A_1 = \sigma_z$, $A_2 = \sigma_x$, $B_1 = \cos\theta\sigma_x + \sin\theta\sigma_z$, $B_2 = -\cos\theta\sigma_x + \sin\theta\sigma_z$, $C_1 = \sigma_x$. For these measurement settings, the expectation value of the above Bell operator for the generalized GHZ state is

$$\langle GGHZ|\, A_1(B_1 + B_2) + A_2(B_1 - B_2)C_1\, |GGHZ\rangle\,. \tag{15}$$

Its value is $2[2\alpha\beta\cos\theta + (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)\sin\theta] = 2[2\alpha\beta\cos\theta + \sin\theta]$. Now, $a\sin\phi + b\cos\phi \leq \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$. Therefore $\langle GGHZ|\, A_1(B_1 + B_2) + A_2(B_1 - B_2)C_1\, |GGHZ\rangle$ is less or equal to $2\sqrt{1 + 4\alpha^2\beta^2}$, which is always greater than 2 for nonzero α, β and gives maximum value $2\sqrt{2}$ for the conventional GHZ state. The upper bound on the expectation value can be written as $2\sqrt{1 + \mathcal{C}^2}$, where $\mathcal{C} = 2\alpha\beta$. We have also plotted the optimized expectation value of the Bell operator with α^2 in figure (2). From these two plots, it is clear that, the entanglement measure (average Von Neumann entropy over the bipartitions), we introduced and the maximum amount of Bell violation for generalized GHZ states are monotonically related to each other. In a different way, we can say that for the generalized GHZ state, the expectation value of the Bell operator depends on the amount of entanglement. The more is the



FIG. 2. Maximum expectation value of the Bell operator for a generalized GHZ state vs α^2 plot.

entanglement of a state the more Bell nonlocal it is. The quantity $\mathcal{C}$ is like concurrence for a two-qubit bipartite state. This concludes the proof.

As discussed earlier, this is the class of states which was creating problem for MABK, Svetlichny and moreover for all correlation Bell inequalities for a particular range of α and β. However, all states in this class violate all the inequalities in our set.

Proposition 2: *Any separable pure three-qubit state obeys all the inequalities within the set.*

Proof: Our inequalities are the hybrid version of the CHSH inequality. All separable pure three-qubit states can be written, after applying some convenient local unitary transformation as as $|0\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle$. We will use any one of the operators, say $A_1B_2(C_1+C_2)+B_1(C_1-C_2)$, as proof will be same for all the others. We take most general quantum measurements for the five observables, as $A_1 = \sin\theta_1\cos\phi_1\sigma_x + \sin\theta_1\sin\phi_1\sigma_y + \cos\theta_1\sigma_z$ and similarly for other observables A_2, B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2, for which the parameters are θ_2, ϕ_2; θ_3, ϕ_3; θ_4, ϕ_4; θ_5, ϕ_5; θ_6, ϕ_6 respectively. Now, we will calculate the expectation value of the operator for the separable state. Putting the form of the measurement for each operator, we get the expectation value to be $\cos\theta_2(\cos\theta_5-\cos\theta_6)+\cos\theta_1\cos\theta_3(\cos\theta_5+\cos\theta_6)$. Obviously we can write this expression as the conventional CHSH operator like $X_1(Y_1+Y_2)+X_2(Y_1-Y_2)$, where $X_1=\cos\theta_1\cos\theta_3$, $X_2=\cos\theta_2$, $Y_1=\cos\theta_5$, $Y_2=\cos\theta_6$, and $X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2 \leq 1$. So, clearly there will be some value of these operators such that the operator takes the maximum possible value, which is 2 (in analogy with the local-realistic value of CHSH operator). Similarly, for all other inequalities in the set, we will get the optimum violation of 2 for all separable states. This concludes the proof.

Proposition 3: *All biseparable pure three-qubit states violate exactly four inequalities within the set and the amount of violations are same for all the four.*

Proof: This can be proved by observing the form of the inequalities. We can rewrite any biseparable state by local unitary transformations equivalent form of $|0\rangle(\alpha|0\rangle|0\rangle+\beta|1\rangle|1\rangle)$. (We can relabel qubits such that number '2' and '3' are entangled. This state is separable in $1-23$ bipartition. So, those inequalities, which can explore the entanglement between the second and the third qubit will be violated. For example, for the above mentioned state, $A_1B_2(C_1+C_2)+B_1(C_1-C_2)\leq 2$ will be violated, because a CHSH type operator for second and third qubits is embedded in this operator. So, the amount of violation will be exactly same as in the case of two-qubit entangled state and the CHSH operator. Not only this inequality, but there are other three inequalities within this set, which will also be violated in this case. These inequalities are,

$$B_1(C_1+C_2)+A_1B_2(C_1-C_2)\leq 2, \quad (16)$$
$$A_1(B_1+B_2)C_2+(B_1-B_2)C_1\leq 2, \quad (17)$$
$$(B_1+B_2)C_2+A_2(B_1-B_2)C_1\leq 2. \quad (18)$$

So, there are a total of four inequalities, which will be violated for a given pure biseparable state. Also, as all the four operators have the same form (the CHSH form) in second and third particle, the amount of violations will be same in all four cases. And the last important fact is that, no other states (except biseparable pure states) will have same kind of violations, i.e exactly four violations of the same amount.

Until now, we have considered special classes of three-qubit states. One would like to show that any genuinely entangled tripartite state will violate one of our inequalities. For this, we will be presenting numerical evidence, using a general parametrized form of a three-qubit state.

Proposition 4: *For all genuine tripartite entangled states we have violations within the set.*

Proof: We do not have the analytical proof for this proposition. But we present supporting numerical evidence. Any genuinely entangled three-qubit pure state can be written in a canonical form [23] with six parameters. This form includes the GHZ and W class states [24] for three qubits. For biseparable pure states, we have already provided proof for the violation of inequalities within the set. The canonical form of a general three-qubit state is,

$$|\psi\rangle = \lambda_0|0\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle + \lambda_1 e^{i\phi}|1\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle + \lambda_2|1\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle + \lambda_3|1\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle + \lambda_4|1\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where $\lambda_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i {\lambda_i}^2 = 1$, $\lambda_0 \neq 0$, $\lambda_2+\lambda_4 \neq 0$, $\lambda_3+\lambda_4 \neq 0$ and $\phi \in [0,\pi]$.

We have randomly generated 35,000 states and tested our set of Bell inequalities. The expectation value of a Bell operator is optimized by considering all possible measurement settings for all observables. Starting from the inequality (1) from the set, we continued with other inequalities one after one until all the generated states violate one inequality from the set. Results are displayed in figures (3-9).

At first, Bell inequality (1) was tested for these randomly generated states and out of 35,000 states, 2099 states do not violate this inequality, as shown in figure (3). Then using the inequality (2) with these 2099 states, number of states which do not violate these first two inequalities was further reduced to 120 states, as shown in figure (4). Similarly, applying the other Bell inequalities from the proposed set one by one the number of states showing no violation for those inequalities can be reduced to zero. We have shown in figures (3-9), starting from 35000 random states, violation for each state has been obtained using first seven inequalities from the proposed set.



FIG. 3. Optimum value of the Bell operator (1). Out of 35000 states, 2099 states do not violate this inequality. States which violate the inequality are shown by red points and those do not are shown by blue points.

However, this random generation of states would not be setting any of the parameters as zero. But we should consider those states also for numerical checking. So, we have generated 5000 states each for 9 more classes of states, by setting some of the parameters as zero.

These classes are obtained as, only $\lambda_1 = 0$, only $\lambda_2 = 0$, only $\lambda_3 = 0$, only $\lambda_4 = 0$, only $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 = 0$, only $\lambda_1, \lambda_3 = 0$, only, $\lambda_1, \lambda_4 = 0$, only, $\lambda_2, \lambda_3 = 0$, Only, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 = 0$. For each of theses class, ϕ is arbitrary. We have taken 5000 random values of each parameter for each class and found violations within the set of 12 inequalities in each case. Based on this and the fact that all generalized GHZ class states violate each inequality (already proved), we expect that this set can certify genuine tripartite entanglement.



FIG. 4. Optimum value of the Bell operator (2). Out of 2099 states, 120 states do not violate this inequality. States which violate the inequality are shown by red points and those do not are shown by blue points.



FIG. 5. Optimum value of the Bell operator (3). Out of 120 states, 36 states do not violate this inequality. States which violate the inequality are shown by red points and those do not are shown by blue points.



FIG. 6. Optimum value of the Bell operator (4). Out of 36 states, 26 states do not violate this inequality. States which violate the inequality are shown by red points and those do not are shown by blue points.



FIG. 7. Optimum value of the Bell operator (5). Out of 26 states, 11 states do not violate this inequality. States which violate the inequality are shown by red points and those do not are shown by blue points.



FIG. 8. Optimum value of the Bell operator (6). Out of 11 states, 7 states do not violate this inequality. States which violate the inequality are shown by red points and those do not are shown by blue points.



FIG. 9. Optimum value of the Bell operator (7). Out of 7 states, all the states violate this inequality. So, there are 7 red points and no blue points.

IV. MULTI-QUBIT STATES

We have established that our set of inequalities are violated by any entangled three-qubit state. We can generalize this set of inequalities to n-qubit states. This extension for multi-qubit scenario is straight-forward. One will have to distinguish between two cases – odd number of qubits and even number of qubits. Starting from the operator, of which GHZ state is an eigenstate, one can construct many different sets of Bell inequalities. We will discuss the simplest case. In this set, for even n, there will be a set of n inequalities; while for odd n, the number will rise to $2n(n-1)$. The set is larger for odd number of qubits, because we have choice of making one measurement on any of n qubits; while in the case of even n, two measurements are made on all qubits. Therefore, we have to construct different type of inequalities for even and odd number of particles. We have already seen that the GHZ state of three qubits is eigenstate of the operator $\sqrt{2}(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z \otimes I)$ with the highest eigenvalue $2\sqrt{2}$. This form of the operator can be generalized for any n-qubit GHZ state, when n is odd. n-qubit GHZ states is the eigenstate of the operator $\sqrt{2}(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_x^{nth} + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_z^{(n-1)th} \otimes I)$ with the highest eigenvalue $2\sqrt{2}$. So, like the three-qubit case, we have to consider non-correlation Bell inequalities when n is odd. The first two Bell inequalities (1) and (2) can be generalized for n-qubit pure states as,

$$A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5..(A_n + A'_n) + A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5..(A_n - A'_n) \leq 2, \quad (20)$$

and

$$A_2A_3A_4A_5..(A_n + A'_n) + A_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5..(A_n - A'_n) \leq 2. \quad (21)$$

Here, A_i and A'_i are two dichotomic observable for i^{th} party. In these inequalities, one measurement has been made on first qubit. Similarly one can make single measurement on $(n-2)$ other qubits. This will lead to $2(n-1)$ inequalities. We can write n such $2(n-1)$ inequalities with $(A_i \pm A'_i)$ for i^{th} qubit. This will give a total of $2n(n-1)$ inequalities. For finding maximal violation, we consider all allowed A_i and A'_i, therefore their positions in the inequalities can be interchanged. The above set of inequalities can be used to characterize the entanglement of n-qubit states for odd n. There are different ways for extending the three-qubit inequalities to n-qubit pure states, this set gives the simplest generalization. In the case of generalized n-qubit GHZ states, any one of these generalized inequalities is enough. One can show that for odd number of qubits these non-correlation Bell inequalities are violated by all generalized GHZ states with maximum violation of $2\sqrt{2}$ for the conventional GHZ state. The proof is similar to the three-qubit case. Situation changes when one considers

GHZ like states with even number of qubits. Because now, like the Bell states, the conventional GHZ state of n qubits (n is even) is the eigenstate of the operator $\sqrt{2}(\sigma_x\otimes\sigma_x\otimes\sigma_x\otimes\cdots\otimes\sigma_x^{nth}+\sigma_z\otimes\sigma_z\otimes\cdots\otimes\sigma_z^{(n-1)th}\otimes\sigma_z)$ with highest eigenvalue $2\sqrt{2}$. This suggests that correlation Bell inequalities are required in this case. For example, one can generalize the first correlation Bell inequality as,

$$(A_1+A_1')A_2A_3A_4A_5..A_n+ \\ (A_1-A_1')A_2'A_3'A_4'A_5'..A_n' \leq 2. \quad (22)$$

Similarly, n such inequalities with $(A_i \pm A_i')$ can be written. Again, among these correlation Bell inequalities any one of them can be used for generalized GHZ states. The proof that any generalized GHZ state with even number of qubits violate these inequalities can be carried along the same line as for the three-qubit case. The fact that generalized GHZ states with even number of qubits violate a correlation Bell inequality within the set of all correlation Bell inequalities [17] was known [18]. But it is important to note that, the correlation Bell inequality violated by the generalized GHZ state with even number of qubits, may not be MABK inequalities. Here, we have introduced a set of correlation Bell inequality which must be violated by all generalized GHZ states with even number of qubits. Like three-qubit states, one may expect that any n-qubit pure state for odd value of n will violate one of the $2n(n-1)$ inequalities like in (20) and (21), while for even n, one of the n inequalities like in (22) will be violated.

Proposition 5: *Multiqubit extension of the inequalities are violated by multiqubit generalized GHZ states.*

Proof: Let's consider the generalized n-qubit GHZ state

$$|GGHZ\rangle_n = \alpha\,|00.....00\rangle + \beta\,|11.....11\rangle\,. \quad (23)$$

In this state, first term represents all n qubits in the '0' state and the second term is for all n qubits in the '1' state. The proof will follow exactly same steps as in the proposition 1. The results will also be identical. In the case of both even and odd n, the maximal violation would be $2\sqrt{1+\mathcal{C}^2}$, where $\mathcal{C}=2\alpha\beta$. For the n-qubit GHZ state $\mathcal{C}=1$ and the maximal violation will be $2\sqrt{2}$.

V. CONCLUSION

We have presented a new set of 12 Bell inequalities. Separable three-qubit pure states do not violate any of these inequalities and biseparable pure three-qubit states violate exactly four of them with same maximal amount. A generalized GHZ state violates all the inequalities in the set, with conventional GHZ state giving maximum amount of violation, which is $2\sqrt{2}$. We have also provided numerical evidence that any genuine tripartite entangled pure state will give violation within this set. A key point of this set of inequalities is that one will make only one measurement on one of the qubits. For violation this measurement is necessary. It is similar to original Bell inequality. Unlike MABK and WWŻB inequalities, our set of inequalities is enough to detect and characterize the entanglement in any three-qubit pure state. It can also be used to distinguish between separable, biseparable and genuinely entangled pure three qubit states. One can also examine the three-qubit mixed states, where one may expect to find the phenomenon of hidden nonlocality with respect to our set of inequalities. These inequalities have also been generalized for multi-qubit scenario. Each of these inequality will be violated by a generalized multi-qubit GHZ states. It is highly likely that a set of inequalities similar to three-qubit states can detect and characterize the entanglement of multi-qubit states. However in the absence of a parametrized form of a pure entangled states beyond three-qubit case, we cannot do numerical analysis for the whole set.

[1] B. Hensen *et al.*, *Nature* **526**, 682 (2015); M. Giustina *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 250401 (2015); L. K. Shalm *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 250402 (2015).
[2] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
[3] N. Brunner *et al.*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **86**, 419 (2015).
[4] J. F. Clauser *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
[5] N. Gisin, *Phys. Lett. A* **154**, 201 (1991).
[6] B. S. Tsirelson, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **4**, 93 (1980); B. S. Tsirelson, *J. Sov. Math.* **36** , 557 (1987).
[7] R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
[8] D. Collins *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 170405 (2002).
[9] G. Svetlichny, *Phys. Rev. D* **35**, 3066 (1987).
[10] N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990); M. Ardehali, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 5375 (1992); A. V. Belinskii and D. N. Klyshko, *Phys. Usp.* **36**, 653 (1993).
[11] N. Gisin and H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, *Phys. Lett. A* **246**, 1 (1998).
[12] V. Scarani and N. Gisin, *J. Phys. A* **34**, 6043 (2001).
[13] M. Seevinck and J. Uffink, *Phys. Rev. A.* **65**, 012107 (2002).
[14] S. Ghose, N. Sinclair, S. Debnath, P. Rungta, and R. Stock, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 250404 (2009); A. Ajoy, and P. Rungta, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 052334 (2010).
[15] J. D. Bancal *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 014102 (2013).
[16] M. Żukowski, Č. Brukner, W. Laskowski, and M. Wieśniak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 210402 (2002).
[17] R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 032112 (2001); M. Żukowski and Č. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 210401 (2002).
[18] S. K. Choudhary, S. Ghosh, G. Kar, and R. Rahaman, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 042107 (2010); Sixia Yu, Qing Chen,

Chengjie Zhang, C. H. Lai and C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 120402 (2012) and references within.

[19] Chandan Datta, Arpan Das and Satyabrata Adhikari *in preparation*

[20] S. L. Braunstein, A. Mann, and M. Rezven, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 3259 (1992).

[21] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **7**, 1 (2007) and references within.

[22] M. Enríquez, I. Wintrowicz and K. Życzkowski, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **698**, 012003 (2016) and references within.

[23] A. Acín *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 040401 (2001).

[24] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000).